

him out early so he could murder again.

Who is accountable for that? Is somebody going to lose his or her job? The last time a Federal judge sent him to Federal prison he didn't go. Who is accountable for that? Or he gets to go to his mother's wake, this fellow who has murdered twice. Who is accountable for that? Who is going to tell the Pruckmayr family: We are sorry. This is just the way bureaucracy works.

It ought not be the way the system works anywhere.

I want to say to the Mayor of this city and the folks who run the criminal justice system in this city, I am not someone who bashes the city of the District of Columbia. I have never done that. Some do, but I do not. But I say today I am on the Appropriations Committee and you are going to pay a price. You are going to pay a price for this gross, staggering, incompetence, unless someone is held accountable for this kind of nonsense.

People have the right to expect the streets are safe. People have the right to expect that murderers are not walking up and down the streets in this country. And in the District of Columbia, at least, they knew this fellow was a murderer—he had murdered before, committed armed robbery before, committed rape before—only for them to say somehow: We decided to put him back on the streets. Then a Federal judge says: I want him in Federal prison forever. The District of Columbia cannot even get that right.

We need to understand why. I do not mean this as a threat. I just mean it as a promise. They are going to pay a price unless they demonstrate to the American people and to this Congress they are holding people accountable for this kind of gross negligence and gross incompetence.

I never met Bettina Pruckmayr. I have spoken in the Senate about a young 11-year-old boy, I suppose, about a half dozen times as well. They found that young boy dead. They found grass and dirt between his fingers. He was also killed by a guy who previously had been convicted of murder. That young boy was stabbed many times and left for dead in a pond, except he was not dead. He tried to crawl his way out. He died at the top of the embankment with dirt and grass between his fingers.

He should never have been murdered. He was murdered by someone we knew was a murderer, because he murdered before. But the system said it was OK that he be let out of jail.

The exact same thing is true with this young woman, Bettina Pruckmayr. She ought not have died. Her death is on someone's conscience. I do not know who it is. Who makes these decisions? Who makes the decisions that these killers be turned loose on our streets?

I have come to the floor today only to ask the question: Who makes the decision to say to a Federal judge you may want this person in a Federal pris-

on out of society for life, but we have decided differently. We will stick him back in Lorton and when his mother dies, he can go to the wake.

Who makes that decision? Who is going to be held accountable for this, because this is the same kind of staggering incompetence that led to this person's release in the first place, that led to this person not being apprehended when he failed a drug test while on parole. It is the same staggering incompetence.

I am saying as one Member of the Senate that when we take a look at our obligations and I as an appropriator take a look at our obligations to the District of Columbia, I will insist that the mayor and others in this system demonstrate to us that they have held people accountable for this kind of behavior.

Too many innocent people die. I have had a piece of legislation in the Senate—I have never been able to get it passed and I will never quit trying—that says if a unit of government, a city, a State, decides they want to let killers out early, time off for good behavior; we want to manage you in prison, so we will give you an inducement: If you behave in prison we will give you time off. If you commit violent crimes and murder, we will let you out early if you are good behind bars so you can walk the streets early and commit another crime.

What I have said is those units of government that decide to let people convicted of violent crimes out early, if those people commit a violent crime during a period when they would have still been serving their sentence in prison, should be held responsible to the victims and the victims' families. Yes, that means lawsuits, recompense.

There ought to be responsibility. Let's find those who are letting these folks out of prison and say to them: You be responsible. If you want to let them out early, then you bear the consequences.

Am I upset by reading this story this morning? Yes, I am. Again, I did not know this young woman, but I have spoken about her often, and many others have, I believe, watched this case with bewilderment, wondering who on Earth could be in charge of a system that is so fundamentally incompetent, a system that, in my judgment, ultimately allowed this person to be free on the streets to kill this young woman, a system that now can't even comply with a simple order by a Federal judge that this person ought to be in Federal prison forever, never again to be released on the streets in this country.

People of this country deserve better and expect better. Those of us in the Congress who have some capability of applying some pressure to the people of the District of Columbia to remedy these problems have an obligation, it seems to me, to use that leverage to force that to happen.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Y2K ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The Senate continued with the consideration of the motion.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am ready with an amendment. I inquire as to what the situation is right now on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is under the motion to proceed to S. 96, the Y2K bill.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I actually will not ask unanimous consent because there is nobody here on the majority party side. I want to go forward with an amendment on the juvenile justice bill, but I guess I will wait until Senator HATCH comes to the floor.

I will, therefore, speak a little about an amendment I will offer. That way, it certainly will not be tricky or sneaky on my part.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION EFFORTS

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am going to offer an amendment with Senator KENNEDY. We will be joined by other Senators as well. The operative language of this amendment, to give it some context, calls upon the States to "address juvenile delinquency prevention efforts and system improvement efforts designed to reduce, without establishing or requiring numerical standards or quotas"—we make that explicit; nobody is talking about any quotas—"the disproportionate number of juvenile members of racial minority groups who come into contact with the juvenile justice system."

With some charts and with some numbers, I will be able to talk about this amendment, as will other Senators. I want, for the record, to make it clear that since we are in a debate about whether or not we are ready to proceed, I am on the floor with an amendment. I am ready to go.

This particular amendment says that in our past juvenile justice legislation, most recently an amendment that was adopted by the Senate and the House in 1993, we said to States, including my own State of Minnesota: You have a situation where you have kids, young people, minorities incarcerated all out of proportion to the percentage of the population in your State. So that if you have, let's say, a 7 or 8 or 10 percent minority population but, in your juvenile justice system or correctional facilities, close to 40 or 50 percent of the kids incarcerated are kids of color, what we said back in 1993, based upon some very good work by some very good people in this field was, States, please take a look at your situation. Please collect the data. Please look at the why of this and see what kind of strategies and programs you can develop and implement to improve upon the situation. That is what this is all about.

For some reason in this bill that is before us, this language has been